

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/864,595	COLLINS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jan M. Ludlow	1743	

All Participants:

(1) Jan M. Ludlow.

(2) Cliff Liu.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2004

Time: 6pm EST (3 pm PST)

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

all

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

all

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner left a message indicating that the arguments were not persuasive because they did not address the obviousness of calculating retention time and changing column length as presented in the rejection, and an Advisory Action would be forthcoming.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments do not address the specifics of the rejection, i.e., they do not argue the obviousness of calculating retention time from the equations based on the teaching (motivation) presented in the prior art, or the obviousness of making the column longer based on the teaching (motivation) in the prior art that longer columns enhance separation. Applicant merely states that the prior art does not teach or suggest these features without arguing why the features are not obvious based on the teachings .